

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3 and 5 are amended and claims 6 and 7 are added. No new matter is added by this Amendment. Claim 3 is amended to correct a typographical error, and claim 5 is amended to overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Support for new claim 6 can be found throughout the original specification, for example at Figures 1(1)-1(4). Support for new claim 7 can be found throughout the original specification, for example at page 2, line 25 through page 3, line 4 and Figure 1.

Because the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is overcome for the reasons discussed below, claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

I. **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph**

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office alleges that the original disclosure does not provide support for the recitation "simultaneously masking the surface," as recited in claim 5. To expedite the prosecution of this application, claim 5 has been amended to delete this recitation.

For the foregoing reasons, claim 5 complies with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,053,973 ("Tanino 973"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office alleges that Tanino 973 describes polycrystal SiC (2e) formed in a flat plate shape around an outer circumference of a small diameter α-SiC single crystal wafer (5), and that the top and bottom surface of the single crystal wafer is free of polycrystal SiC (see Figure 4 of Tanino 973). Applicants disagree.

Tanino 973 does not describe "a film of polycrystal SiC in a flat plate shape around an outer circumference of a small diameter  $\alpha$ -SiC single crystal wafer," as recited in claim 1. Instead, the polycrystal SiC (2e) of Tanino 973 is an overhang portion from the vapor deposition and has a rounded triangular shape (for example, see Figure 4 of Tanino 973). The Patent Office's allegation that Tanino 973 forms a flat plate shape is thus incorrect.

Further, nothing in Tanino 973 provides any reason or rationale why one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the shape of polycrystal SiC (2e) disclosed therein to arrive at the flat plate shape polycrystal SiC recited in claim 1. Tanino 973 provides no guidance on how such a flat plate shape could be obtained, and thus also fails to provide any reasonable expectation of success in attempting any modification.

For the foregoing reasons, Tanino 973 does not describe all of the features recited in claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Tanino 973 In View Of Kordina

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tanino 973 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,674,320 ("Kordina"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kordina does not remedy the deficiencies of Tanino 973. Specifically, Kordina also does not describe "a film of polycrystal SiC in a flat plate shape around an outer circumference of a small diameter  $\alpha$ -SiC single crystal wafer," as recited in claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Tanino 973 and Kordina, in combination or alone, do not describe all of the features recited in claim 2. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. Tanino 973 In View Of Tanino 165

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tanino 973 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,153,165 ("Tanino 165"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Tanino 165 does not remedy the deficiencies of Tanino 973. Specifically, Tanino 165 also does not describe "a film of polycrystal SiC in a flat plate shape around an outer circumference of a small diameter  $\alpha$ -SiC single crystal wafer," as recited in claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Tanino 973 and Tanino 165, in combination or alone, do not describe all of the features recited in claim 3. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

IV. New Claims 6 And 7

A. Claim 6

Claim 6 depends from claim 5, which was not rejected relying upon art. Claim 6 is thus also allowable over the art.

B. Claim 7

None of Tanino 973, Kordina and Tanino 165, in combination or alone, describe a large-diameter SiC wafer having a diameter that is about three times larger than a diameter of the  $\alpha$ -SiC single crystal wafer, as required in dependent claim 7.

Thus, none of Tanino 973, Kordina and Tanino 165 describe the large-diameter SiC wafer recited in claim 7.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-7 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Leana Levin  
Registration No. 51,939

JAO:LL/hs

Date: September 10, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---